

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23-25, 29, 30, and 32 are amended to better define the claimed invention, and claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 18, 19, 27, and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Figs. 2-8 are replaced with corrected drawings with higher resolution. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5, 8-13, 15-17, 20-26, and 29-32 are pending for examination in this application.

Requirement to provide corrected drawings

New corrected drawings are required by the Examiner because FIGs. 3-8 are not legible. In response, Figs. 3-8 are replaced by corrected drawings with higher resolution and submitted to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), and Fig. 2 is also amended. Support for the corrected drawings can be found at least from the original specification and claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11, 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardeep (US 2005/0159158) in view of Wallentin (US 2006/02348706), and further in view of Yu, "Overview of EIA/TIA IS-41," in Proceedings, PIMRC '92., Third IEEE International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications, 1992. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In general, the present application discloses that the mobile switching centers of different communication systems exchange management messages in an invoke state, thereby checking a status of the trunk line between the mobile switching centers.

With regard to independent claim 1, it is acknowledged in the Office Action that Pardeep does not disclose checking a status of the truck line between the asynchronous mobile switching center and the synchronous mobile switching center. In this regard, Wallentin is relied upon to disclose resetting network control nodes, and Yu is relied upon to disclose certain commands set forth in IS-41 standard. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In response, independent claim 1 is amended to recite, among other things, “checking a status of the trunk line between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center by exchanging trunk line management messages between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center, when the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center are in an invoke state for the handover.” Applicants respectfully submit that Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features.

First, Pardeep discloses a handoff solution of a terminal in a GSM communication system and a CDMA communication system using a Hybrid Mobile Switching Center. See Abstract and Fig. 3 of Pardeep. Although the “asynchronous mobile switching center” and the “synchronous mobile switching center” recited in original claim 1 are amended and replaced with “a first mobile switching center of a first mobile communication system” and “a second mobile switching center of a second mobile communication system,” it is submitted that the amendment does not affect the assertion made in the Office Action that Pardeep does not disclose the recited checking a status of the trunk line between two mobile switching centers when both mobile switching centers are in an invoke state for the handover.

Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that Wallentin does not disclose or suggest the recited checking status of the truck line. More specifically, Wallentin discloses a method of transmitting a reset message from a control node to a user equipment controlled by the affected control node. See Abstract of Wallentin. However, Wallentin is silent about checking a status of the trunk line between two mobile switching centers when both mobile switching centers are in an invoke state for the handover. In fact, in Wallentin, the connection between the selected user equipment and the control node will be released as a result of the reset message. See Fig. 3 of Wallentin, for example. On the contrary, the purpose of the claimed invention recited in amended claim 1 is to ensure that the trunk line between a first mobile switching center and a second switching center operates normally. As such, it is submitted that, to a person of ordinary skill in the art, Wallentin cannot be deemed to disclose or suggest the admitted deficiencies of Pardeep.

Finally, although Yu discloses that IS-41 standard defines Operation, Administration, and Maintenance (OA&M) messages for operating and maintaining the inter-MSC facilities, such as

Blocking, Unblocking, ResetCircuit, TrunkTest, and TrcukTestDisconnect, it is respectfully submitted that Yu merely discloses messages for operation and management between exchangers and is silent with regard to the recited “checking a status of the trunk line between two mobile switching centers when both mobile switching centers are in an invoke state for the handover.” As such, Yu also fails to remedy the admitted deficiencies of Pardeep.

Therefore, Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the recited ““checking a status of the trunk line between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center by exchanging trunk line management messages between the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center, when the first mobile switching center and the second mobile switching center are in an invoke state for the handover.”” Claim 1 is deemed to be patentable over applied references.

Amended independent claim 23 recites a system configured to perform substantially the method recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1, claim 23 is deemed to be patentable over Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu. Claims 3-5, 8, 9, 11, 24-26, 29, and 30 are likewise patentable over applied references for their dependencies on claims 1 and 23. Cancellation of claims 2, 6, 7, 27, and 28 renders the rejection of these claims moot. Withdrawal of the rejection under § 103 (a) is respectfully solicited.

Claims 12, and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanghi (US 2005/0073977) in view of Wallentin, and further in view of Yu. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to claim 12, it is acknowledged in the Office Action that Vanghi does not disclose checking a status of the truck line between mobile switching centers, and Wallentin and Yu are relied upon to remedy the admitted deficiencies. Based on similar reasons as presented for claim 1, it is submitted that Wallentin and Yu both fail to disclose or suggest the recited “checking a status of the trunk line between two mobile switching centers when both mobile switching centers are in an invoke state for the handover.”

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 12 is deemed to be patentable over Vanghi, Wallentin, and Yu. Claims 15-17, 20, and 21 are likewise patentable over applied

references for their dependencies on claim 12. Cancellation of claims 14, 18, and 19 renders the rejection of these claims moot. Withdrawal of the rejection under § 103 (a) is respectfully solicited.

Claims 10, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pardeep in view of Wallentin and Yu, and further in view of Sicher (US 5,570,411) or Vanghi; and claims 13 and 22 are rejected over Vanghi in view of Wallentin and Yu, and further in view of Pardeep or Sicher. After reviewing the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that Sicher is further relied upon to disclose the additional features recited in claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32. However, Sicher fails to at least remedy the deficiencies of Vanghi, Pardeep, Wallentin, and Yu. As such, claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32 are believed to be patentable over applied references for at least their dependencies on independent claims 1, 12, and 23. Withdrawal these rejections of claims 10, 13, 22, 31, and 32 under § 103(a) is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: June 2, 2010
YSH/TC/jr